

RECEIVED

EIS000496

17 NOV 16 1999 MR. STOKLEY: Afternoon. I'm John
18 Stokley. As a licensed mechanical engineer. I've
19 spent the last 15 years or so providing technical
20 support to the United States Nuclear Regulatory Agency,
21 specifically in the activities pertaining to licensing
22 of spent nuclear fuel casks for the independent fuel
23 storage installations.

24 My company, Science Applications
25 International Corporation, has assisted the NRC in

31

1 virtually all of the hydro casks, which utilize
2 reinforced concrete structures providing radiological
3 shielding against heat transfer and a protection
4 against all manner of environmental phenomena.

5 During the course of this work, I and my
6 colleagues have become very familiar with the law, i.e.
7 10CFR part 72, and to a lesser extent 10CFR parts 70,
8 71, and 73. Collectively, we have worn the hat of a
9 regulator, and have a very healthy respect for the
10 legal language contained in these legal codes.

11 The health and safety of the public is a
12 primary concern in the exercise to find a solution to
13 the interim storage of spent fuel at an ISFSI.
14 Speaking as a private citizen but also as an engineer,
15 I can state that the implementation of a legal code
16 does in fact provide for a high degree of safety for
17 the public.

18 The next logical step in the safe storage
19 of the spent nuclear fuel away from the individual
20 reactor sites is to find an equally safe and
21 technically supported solution for the long-term
22 storage. The federal government mandated such a
23 solution in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

24 In fact, the federal government has had a
25 legal obligation to begin taking spent fuel into

1 storage in January of 1998, which it obviously has
2 failed to do.

1 (continued)

3 The cost of energy to consumers increases
4 each year that the federal government fails to meet its
5 obligation to accept spent fuel; however, no one wants
6 to make the case that the cost to consumers is an
7 overriding consideration here. The primary
8 consideration, obviously, is the health and safety of
9 the public.

2

10 I feel that the tremendous amount of work
11 that has gone into the creation of this draft
12 Environmental Impact Statement supports the finding
13 that we should go forward with it. And that's
14 basically what I have to say. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

16 Let me call John McClure again.

17 We'll move on to the next speaker. Allan

18 Turner?